



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

ENGLISCHE PHILOLOGIE, Anleitung zum wissenschaftlichen Studium der englischen Sprache. Von JOHAN STORM, ord. Professor der romanischen und englischen Philologie an der Universität Christiania. Vom Verfasser für das deutsche Publikum bearbeitet. I. Die lebende Sprache. Heilbronn, Gebr. Henninger, 1881. (pp. xvi, 468.)

This work is a revised and enlarged edition in German of the author's Swedish work published a few years ago, and so it appeals to a much wider circle of readers. It consists of preface, introduction, and the following chapters: I. Allgemeine Phonetik; II. Englische Aussprache; III. Wörterbücher; IV. Synonymik, Phraseologie, Praktische Hilfsmittel; V. Lektüre und Literaturstudium; VI. Literaturgeschichte; VII. Grammatik; and closes with Additions, and Indexes of Authors and Words.

In his preface the author says: "Auf die Phonetik, die Grundlage der neueren Sprachwissenschaft, habe ich ein besonderes Gewicht gelegt," which is manifest, as out of 424 pages, 112 are devoted to phonetics, and 10 of the 16 pages of Additions relate to this section. While welcoming all light thrown by this new science upon the problems of language, it is to be feared that phonetic specialists are pushing their specialty too far for ordinary philologists, as it is nowadays certainly given the lion's share. It is well to use moderation, and to remember that to be a first-class phonetist requires an exceedingly fine ear, which cannot be expected of most students of language; that phonetists themselves are not at one with respect to many sounds, and that the philological study of a language can be very thoroughly pursued without the immense labor required to master the nice distinctions of sounds, many of which cannot be mastered without a trained instructor, and often do not occur at all in the language under consideration.

The introduction gives a clear idea of the object of the work, which is "den Studirenden die besten und neuesten, nothwendigsten und zweckmässigsten Hilfsmittel zum philologischen Studium der englischen Sprache anzugeben"; and it seems that, following the example of Schmitz, a more accurate title for the work would have been "Encyclopädie des philologischen Studiums der englischen Sprache."

Phonetics preponderates in the introduction, and the author lays great stress upon the acquirement of an accurate pronunciation of any language, a very desirable accomplishment; but nine-tenths, if not ninety-nine hundredths, of our students pursue the study of a foreign language with a view to learning how to read it fluently so as to enjoy its literature, and to write it in case of need, by which means they acquire also a more thorough knowledge of its grammatical structure, but they never expect to speak the language, as they have no opportunity so to do.

The chapter on General Phonetics is a useful résumé of the works on this subject, with a detailed discussion of some of them. It notices the works of Rapp, Merkel, Brücke, Rumpelt, Lepsius, Helmholtz, Sievers, Trautmann, Bell, Ellis, Sweet, and Lundell, the last a Swedish phonetist, and discusses at length those of Sievers, *Grundzüge der Lautphysiologie*, and Sweet, *A Handbook of Phonetics*, the leaders in their respective countries of the modern phonetic school. The author takes exception to some of Brücke's statements, *e. g.* (p. 20), "englisches *a* in *man* identificirt [Brücke] mit deutschem *ä* und französischem *ê*, das er wieder von *ê* unterscheidet, von dem es in der That nur durch die Länge verschieden ist." Storm's exception to Brücke's view is correct certainly with respect to English *a*, but French *ê* in *bête* seems to an untrained ear to approach more nearly to *ê* in *idée* (Trautmann, p. 52), though more prolonged, than to *ê* in *père*, Sweet's *e* mid-front-narrow rather than *ae* low-front-narrow. Storm again corrects Brücke (p. 23), and Sievers (p. 45), with respect to the sound of English sonant *th*, where they think they hear *dʒ*, a remarkable combination, importing German conceptions into English pronunciation, and rightly characterized by Sweet as "never heard by any Englishman," nor, I would add, by any American. Be it also remarked in passing that the *h* for *th*, as *I think* for *I think*, noticed by Sweet (p. 45, note 1) and Sievers (p. 430), is altogether un-American,¹ and furnishes one more illustration, if any were needed, of the fact that the pronunciation of the English language is more corrupt in England itself than in the United States, notwithstanding the slur cast by Storm (p. 128): "Es gilt die englische Aussprache zu kennen, nicht die amerikanische." Storm rightly corrects Rumpelt also when he says (p. 30): "Der Laut des frz. *j* findet sich im Englischen nur in romanischen Wörtern wie *mansion*, *pretension*." When distinguished German phonetists make such blunders with respect to English pronunciation, how can we follow them? To Sievers's work is given nineteen pages and to Sweet's twenty-five. One of the most evident results of these examinations is that the English cannot pronounce French, for they are credited with pronouncing long *a* in *pâte*, *pas*, as *aw* (pp. 35, 59), short *a* in *patte* as *a* in *pat* (p. 35), and with various blunders in respect to the nasals. In his examination of Bell's work Storm says expressly: "Die Vokalqualität der französischen Nasenlaute richtig aufzufassen scheint für einen Engländer fast unmöglich zu sein" (p. 58); and with respect to the *aw*-pronunciation: "Auch die meisten englischen Phonetiker vermögen sich von diesem Eindruck nicht zu emancipiren" (p. 59). I am not aware that American phonetists, if such there be, make these blunders. Certainly to an untrained ear what Storm says about French sounds seems strictly correct, with the exception above noted. Storm misses in Sievers "eine bestimmte und scharfe Analyse der Vokale," which he finds in Sweet especially, and gives his table in full (p. 65). With respect to *r* Storm says (p. 39): "Nach Vokalen ist *r* den engl. Phonetikern zufolge zu blossen 'vocal murmur' herabgesunken," which is generally true, although in his *History of English Sounds*, Sweet does not represent accurately American pronunciation of *r*; but how Sievers can say, with Storm's approval, "Wörter wie *tried* für ein ungeübtes Ohr fast nicht von solchen wie *chide* zu

¹ Also "*flee*" for "*fellow*" (p. 25, note 2) is never heard in this country, although "*feller*" is common enough.

unterschieden sind," is incomprehensible: certainly every educated American pronounces his *r* in that connection distinctly enough. Sievers claims in the text that English *t, d, r, l, n, sh*, are *cerebral* (*kakuminal*), although Sweet says expressly, "No supradentals in English," (p. 42), using "supradental" for "cerebral," as Storm explains in a note (p. 429), but this statement, at least with respect to *sh*, is corrected in a note by Sievers (p. 429).¹ The numerous notes at the foot of the page and in the Additions make the reading of this lengthy phonetic section very inconvenient and increase its difficulty, for as here we find statements made in the text which are corrected in the notes.

Storm closes his notice of Sievers's book with some commendatory remarks, but says (p. 50): "Ueberhaupt findet man bei den Deutschen ein zu starkes Theoretisiren, eine allzu abstrakte Behandlung ohne hinreichende faktische Grundlage," and supports this by Sweet's opinion: "The defect of German phonetics is that it is hardly practical enough"; and again, "The German treatment of the vowels is utterly inadequate—their phonetics break [breaks] down precisely at the most important point. Even Sievers's book shows no material advance on the antiquated division of the vowels." Sievers informs Storm (p. 427) that he is preparing a new edition of his work, "worin das Kapitel über Vokalbildung und manches andere wird gänzlich ungearbeitet werden," so that when phonetists have settled disputed points to their own satisfaction, I hope they will give us a brief, clear, and practical basis for the philological study of a language.

Sweet's work receives the greatest praise, but Storm thinks his list of sound-signs is hard to read and might be simplified to advantage. He devotes more space to a notice of it than of any other work. With respect to *u* in English *but*, Sweet's mid-back-narrow, he warns Germans (p. 64) against making it *ö*, which, he rightly says (p. 66), is a hard sound for the English; but he also warns (p. 431) against the false pronunciation "*bot*," "die zwar in Amerika [!]; aber nicht in England gelten würde." This again is news, and the much-abused Americans must go to German works to learn the pronunciation which prevails in this country. Again, with respect to German *e* in *Gabe*, Sweet's mid-mixed-narrow (Storm's remarks on which deserve attention), Sweet says in a note (p. 432): "The *e* of *Gabe* occurs long in the American [!] pronunciation of 'earth' as (ëëip)." Now the ordinary *American* pronunciation of 'earth' to my ear is *irth*, *ir* as in '*bird*,' '*birth*,' Sweet's low-mixed-narrow. With respect to the *e* of *Gabe* Sievers is certainly right when he says (p. 432): "wir haben alle möglichen Varietäten der Aussprache des unbetonten *e*." This covers the whole ground, and I recollect well pronouncing to a German this *e* final as *u* in English *but* (Sweet's mid-back-narrow), which sound, to my ear, it most nearly approaches, and as close *e* in Frh. *été* (Sweet's mid-front-narrow), which sound I considered incorrect for it, although often heard, and both sounded alike to his ear, showing that an untrained ear does not make the distinction, thus confirming Sievers's remark, and confirming also Sweet's mid-mixed-narrow position for it, being intermediate between the two, but it does not correspond to "the *American* pronunciation of 'earth.'" Storm says with good judgment (p. 73): "die Abschätzung der Vokale bloss nach dem Gehör und subjectivem Gutdünken ist

¹ See also Sweet's note at foot of p. 429, with whom Storm agrees, but they do not use "supradental" in the same sense.

ein verlassener Standpunkt. Um über dieses primitive Stadium hinauszukommen musste man vorläufig vom akustischen Eindruck absehen und bloss auf den Mechanismus des Lautes Rücksicht nehmen. Aber Jedermann versteht, dass die Laute ohne ein scharfes und geübtes Ohr nicht genau unterschieden werden können." While the effort may be made to get rid of the ear and of subjective impressions, the last sentence shows that Storm realizes the difficulty, and it is hard to see how it can ever be avoided,—but phonetists must settle that.

With respect to the consonants, the ordinary American ear finds no "gutturality" in the *l* of *well* (p. 74), thus agreeing with Sweet vs. Storm, and to it the normal *l* is found as clear in English *bell* as in French *belle*. With respect to French syllabification and word-accent, the criticisms of Storm upon Sweet's view are well-sustained and seem justified by the facts of the case. We sometimes hear it said that French has no word-accent, but not, as Sweet, "the word-stress is generally on the first syllable." Storm says (p. 77): "Alle Romanisten sind aber jetzt darüber einig, dass der Wortaccent (*ictus*), wo er sich findet, auf der letzten sonoren Silbe liegt," and this certainly corresponds to the impression made upon "the ordinary American ear," however the English may pronounce French (see p. 81, note 3).

I can hardly agree with Sweet's remark in respect to the sound *h* (p. 83): "It is certain that if English had been left to itself, the sound *h* would have been as completely lost in the standard language as it has been in most of the dialects," or that the distinction between *house* and *'ouse* is "a comparatively slight one." There has been for centuries on this side of the water a large and increasing portion of the English-speaking people, amounting now to double the number in England itself, among whom this Cockney mis-pronunciation has never found a foothold, and to all appearances never will find one, for one marked characteristic of *American* pronunciation is that *h* is never misplaced, and there is no "natural tendency to drop the *h*," thus adding one more proof of the comparative purity of American pronunciation of English. The remarks of both Sweet and Nicol about *r* after a vowel (p. 84) apply with more force to American pronunciation, which in this respect more nearly resembles the English, the retention of strong *r*, accompanied as it often is by a nasal twang, being considered a dialectic peculiarity. Storm does not sympathize fully with Sweet's efforts for "Spelling Reform"; he says (p. 84, note 2): "Wenn man das Englische streng phonetisch schreiben wollte, würde es wegen der grossen Menge gleichlautender Wörter, verdunkelter Vokale und anderer phonetischen Eigenthümlichkeiten schwer genug zu lesen sein. Der Bruch mit dem Bestehenden würde so gewaltsam sein, dass er mit einer vollständigen Umwälzung gleichbedeutend, und die überlieferte Literatur dem Volk ein verschlossenes Buch sein würde. Es ist eine schwere Sache Orthographien wie die englische und die französische zu reformiren. Wenigstens wird es praktischer sein, die gewöhnliche Orthographie zu regeln, als eine ganz neue zu schaffen." While what Sweet says is strictly true, and English spelling needs reforming badly enough in all conscience, we commend to the careful consideration of ardent spelling reformers these judicious remarks of a foreigner, and would mildly suggest, *festina lente*.

Chapter II, on English Pronunciation, gives occasion for much more comment than the limits of this notice will permit. A careful perusal of it causes the

reader to feel sadly the lack of some common system for marking sounds accurately in English. Each phonetist, or lexicographer—but the terms are by no means synonymous—adopts his own system, or no-system, and the general reader must grope among different methods of characterizing the same sound, with the conviction at last that each method is objectionable. If the phonetists, or the spelling reformers, will remedy this deficiency, they will help the cause wonderfully. Before giving the chief authorities for pronunciation, Storm explains his own system of marking the sounds, which will answer well enough, if only others will adopt it; it is certainly an improvement upon those found in most English dictionaries. The works noticed are those of Schmitz, Maetzer, Walker, Knowles, Smart, Nuttall, Donald, Cooley, Cull, Stormonth and Phelps, and the National Pronouncing Dictionary; and of these Smart's edition of Walker receives the longest notice, 13 pages. Webster and Worcester are not even named in the list, although the former's preface is quoted from and the dictionary itself is noticed very briefly in the following chapter on "Dictionaries," but Worcester, the chief authority for pronunciation in this country, is barely mentioned there and altogether ignored here, with the remark: "Amerikanischen und deutschen Wörterbüchern ist mit Bezug auf die Aussprache nur eine beschränkte Autorität beizumessen." One general result from the comments made is, I think, that Walker's pronunciation is better preserved in this country than in England, including even Smart's emendations, but Storm does not seem to be aware of that fact. Many pronunciations of particular words are given which, to my knowledge, are never heard here, and others pronounced antiquated which are in daily use. Both Walker and Smart retain the distinction, universal in this country, between *mourning* and *morning*, while Ellis and Sweet say that Englishmen pronounce the first as the second, *māōning*.¹ Sweet says (p. 93, note 1), "I certainly make no distinction between *mourning* and *morning*. Scotchmen do, as also archaic speakers in London, but it is certainly extinct in the younger generation." It is impossible for one American to speak for the whole country, as we have provincial variations and alternative pronunciations even among educated persons, but I think this will be news to most Americans; also to hear that *gūl* for *girl* is "very common," whereas it is purely vulgar in this country. This is Ellis's assertion, who says that he pronounces *gⁱūl* (p. 94, note 1), while Sweet says: "I think palatal *k* and *g* must be quite extinct in my generation. I only know *girl* as *gūl*, *gāl*, and *gāūl*, which last is my father's pronunciation." Now *girl* with *ir* as in *bird*, Sweet's low-mixed-narrow, Storm's *gūl*, though sometimes with a stronger *r*-sound, is most common in this country, but Ellis's pronunciation is retained in Virginia, this palatal *k* and *g* being a well-known Virginian shibboleth, authorized too by Walker who gives *kⁱaard*,² *gⁱaard* for *card*, *guard*, and similar words. This is evidently derived from the Anglo-Saxon breaking, and shows that pronunciations now antiquated in England are still preserved in Virginia. The long *a* in *father* is also carefully preserved all through Tidewater and parts of Piedmont Virginia in such words as *plant*, *ask*, *ant*, *aunt*, *haunt*, *past*, *half*,

¹ Storm represents by *ɹ* both the *u* in *but* and that in *burn*, which are distinguished by Sweet; also final *er*, as *rider* = *rai'do*.

² Storm is not consistent here with respect to *r*, as p. 94 he gives *kⁱaard*, *gⁱaas'dn*, for *card*, *garden*: Smart and Cooley also give *gⁱaas'dn*.

psalm, *laugh*, *draught*, etc., and I have often heard *k'aa'n't* for *can't* and *k'iaasl* for *castle*. Also Thackeray's *Jeames* (*dzhiims*, Storm) is very common in the mouths of old persons, and even *pint* for *point*, *bile*¹ for *boil*, now considered vulgar, but which prevailed in England in the days of Pope and Johnson. The common narrowing and shortening of the diphthongal sounds *i*, *ei* (*ai*), and *ou* (*au*), as in *mite*, *night*, *sleight*, and *house*, *mouse*, *grouse*,² is not noticed by Storm, nor, I believe, by Sweet, as perhaps it does not prevail in England, but being so common in this country, phonetists should make note of it; also, of the pronunciation of *here*, *hear*, *near*, *year*, with a palatal sound after the initial consonant instead of the pure *ii*, as *hjaə*, *njaə*, *jaə* (cf. *yearn* = *jaən*), instead of *hiia*, *niia*, *yiia*. These are, I think, the only words in which this provincialism is heard, if we except the vulgar pronunciation of *ear* as *jaə*, no distinction being made between *ear* and *year*. So far as I know, all other words with these and corresponding terminations, such as *mere*, *sere*, *fear*, *tear*, *tier*, *pier*, etc., retain the pure *ii*. Here should be added the South Carolinian provincialism of *iia* for *aeae*, as *ðiia* for *there*, *piia* for *pear*, and many other such words. Storm notices the pronunciation of *pure*, *sure* as *pjaə*, *shaə* (p. 114), not heard in this country, to my knowledge, but the provincialisms *pjəə*, *shəə* (not *shāə*), also *pəə* (not *pāə*) for *poor*, are common enough (see also pp. 292, 293). The pronunciation of *oo* for *u*, as in *dooty* for *duty*, so common in the northern part of this country, but nevertheless still provincial, is noticed by Storm only in his sections on "Die Vulgärsprache" and "Amerikanismen" (see pp. 292, 294 and 328, 340). He quotes Alford's remark: "Though many people call *new*, *noo*, no one ever yet called *few*, *foo*."³

Storm finds Walker's *een'tshent* (*ancient*) "eine sonst unerhörte Aussprache" (p. 104): it is common enough here, but *ecin'tshent* would be more exact. He corrects Smart for finding no difference between the *a* of *various* and of *variant*, saying, "der Laut *eei* wird vor *r* zu *ee* oder *aeae*," but he should have added "in the same syllable," for many here pronounce *va-rious* with *a* as in *va'-cant*, authorized too by both Webster and Worcester. This has led him to correct Maetzner also (p. 97) for pronouncing *a* in *Mary* as in *lady*, saying, "es heisst *eei'di*, aber *meg'ri*," but Maetzner gives the more usual pronunciation. With reference to the much discussed *either* and *neither*, he quotes Smart, "usage as well as regularity favors the sound *ii*," but adds (p. 110): "Mir scheint *ai'ðə*, *nai'ðə*, die fashionable und feierliche Aussprache, die man stets z. B. von Predigern hört." Certainly *iðə* is still the more common in this country, and I have heard the late Prof. Haldeman ridicule *ai'ðə* very strongly, but the latter is gaining currency, for American "Prediger" have taken it up, and I fear it is destined to be "die fashionable und feierliche Aussprache" here too.

It is hard to speak with positiveness on many questions of English pronunciation and accent, for orthoëpists differ, and the layman follows that pronunciation to which he has been accustomed, so that neither in this country nor in England is there a common standard observed by all educated persons, and I

¹ *Paint*, *baill*, as Storm writes. This is noticed p. 293, but there represented as *ai*.

² In Storm's symbols it would be, I suppose, *mait* and *mæus*, not *maït*, *maus*; *writer* = *raitə* and *rider* = *rai'də* show the distinction, also *house* = *hæus* and *hound* = *haund*.

³ It is strange that this pronunciation should be so prevalent when it is not authorized by either Webster or Worcester (eds. 1870).

see no justification for the opinion that English is spoken more correctly in England than in America. As already stated, Worcester is regarded here by many persons as a better authority than Webster in these matters, but it seems both are ignored by Storm, who wants to know the *English* and not the *American* pronunciation. It is to be hoped that the Philological Society's Dictionary will be taken as a standard on these points as well as others, and that greater uniformity will then prevail.

Chapter III, on Dictionaries, must be passed over, but Storm's criticisms of the etymologies in some of our standard dictionaries deserve attention.

Chapter IV, on "Synonyms, Phraseology, and Practical Helps," need not detain us long. It begins with Crabbe, whose wonderful etymologies "stehen auf ganz mittelalterlichem Standpunkte," devotes most attention to Roget (34th edition), and omits Soule entirely. In fact, American books receive scant notice on any subject. Most of the works noticed are naturally German and intended to aid Germans in learning English.

The sections on Books of Reference and Encyclopedias, and especially that on English Institutions, are very incomplete. We miss Rees, Appleton, Johnson, and other American works, besides the valuable English collection of monographs known as the Encyclopædia Metropolitana: some of the standard works¹ on English Constitutional History are passed over entirely, and nothing American is admitted here.

Chapter V, on Reading and the Study of Literature, comprises over two hundred pages, nearly one-half of the volume. About three-fourths of it is taken up with the sections on Colloquial English, Vulgar English, and Americanisms. The author thinks that the change from a synthetic to an analytic speech has done the language no harm (p. 207): "In der Kraft des Ausdrucks kann sich schwerlich eine andere mit der englischen messen, und in Klarheit steht sie kaum der französischen nach." Many expressions formerly current among the lower classes alone have penetrated to the higher. He well says (p. 223): "Die Grenze zwischen 'Colloquial' und 'Vulgar' ist oft schwankend. Einer betrachtet als vulgär, was ein Anderer für erlaubt oder regelmässig hält"; and his own remarks furnish good illustrations of this statement. His examples are drawn chiefly from Thackeray, Dickens, and Trollope, but sufficient care is not taken to note whether the language is that of an educated or uneducated person, or whether the author uses bad English purposely. With respect to the pronouns, according to the Horatian dictum, we must allow "it is *me*" (p. 207) to be good English, but that does not justify Mr. Wardle's "it is *them*." The Anglo-Saxon "*ic eom hit*" is precisely analogous to the German "*ich bin es*," but the later language has developed the idiom analogous to the French "*c'est moi*," and doubtless under its influence.² It will not do to correct Abbott for his explanation of "And damned be *him* that first cries 'Hold, enough!'" (p. 210). *Him* has most probably come from the equivalent locution with *let*: as well defend Byron's "Let *he* who made thee answer that" (p. 211), about which Moon's statement is right: "All that it shows was [*is*] that Byron was not correct in his grammar." This is also

¹ Hallam and Stubbs are mentioned, however, on p. 344.

² Cf. p. 234 and Storm's examples from Chaucer of "*it am I*," "*It is me*," "*ist wenigstens vom 16 Jht. an idiomatisch, und damit ist die Frage entschieden*." Cf. also pp. 242 and 334.

shown by Maetznér's quotation from Byron: "Thrice have I *drank* of it" (p. 215, note 2), which cannot be used to justify the use of *drank* as a past participle. Professor A. S. Hill has well shown, in his *Rhetoric*, that nearly all writers are sometimes guilty of such slips. These are instances of mere carelessness and will not do to found usage upon. Moreover, examples from Shakspeare cannot be used to illustrate present use of preterite and past participle, for in his day the forms had not been differentiated. "I have *broke*," "I have *spoke*," become the archaic language of Shakspeare, but will not answer nowadays. "I have *drank*" is bad English, no matter how many examples may be quoted from Dickens and Trollope; and it surprises me to find Sweet writing (p. 216): "'I have *rode*' or '*ridden*' is a question which has puzzled me lately. I am quite unable to decide which I naturally use, and still less to determine what is the general usage. *Rode* is no doubt very common"—not, as far as my experience goes, on this side of the water: I should as soon use for the preterite the old form *rid* (analogous to *bit, ris*), which once justified the pun at the expense of the booted and spurred countryman: "You came to see 'Orpheus and *Eurydice*' (*you-rid-I-see*). While grammatically correct, it would be mere purism to substitute *whom* for *who* in "*Who* can I trust?" (Miss Muloch, p. 212). The loss of the subjunctive is much to be regretted, but grammarians cannot control usage, and I fear the addition of *-er* and *-est* to adjectives of more than one syllable, though so forcible in the archaic style, is doomed to perish. It is not worth while to insist longer upon the distinction between *hung* and *hanged* (p. 219); and Storm has some judicious remarks upon *wake, awake, waken, and awaken*; A. S. *wacan, wæc, wacian, wacode*, and *awacnian*, have been confounded. *Try and do*, however illogical, has fixed itself in the language, and we might as well reject "*I am gone*" as "*I am done*." In the face of so many examples to the contrary, it is scarcely worth while to try to enforce Alford's dictum: "*So* cannot be used in the affirmative proposition, nor *as* in the negative"; Storm well adds: "Dennoch ist er, wie man sieht, sehr häufig." *Worret*, as well as *worrit*, is purely vulgar in this country, even though Trollope and George Eliot are quoted as authority for it.

Lack of space must limit my remarks on the remainder of this section to the fewest possible. It is taken up with discussing Alford's *Queen's English*, Moon's *Dean's English*, and *Bad English Exposed*, and with a few extracts from Hyde Clarke's *Grammar of the English Tongue*. Gould's *Good English* is not noticed, but its author is occasionally referred to by Moon. The main result of the lengthy examination is that Storm sides with the Dean as against Moon and other English critics. Notwithstanding Moon's corrections of Alford's own language, Storm thinks "er hat aber das Wesentliche in Alford's Buch nicht umgestossen." He sees here two schools, the Dean representing natural "colloquial English," and Moon the "klassisch-conservativ," who think "colloquial English is bad English." He convicts Moon of inconsistency, and, while acknowledging that many of his remarks are correct, says: "Er hat aber in vielen Fällen die Sprache schulmeistern wollen, und darin können wir ihm nicht beistimmen." A few expressions may be noticed briefly. *I had rather* is as common here as *I'd rather* or *I would rather*, although Storm's English correspondent says, "it would sound very pedantic" (p. 230, note 1). Even if *I'd rather* may be short for *I would rather*, that *I had rather* is not expanded from it (as both Storm

and Sweet suggest), and that it is good English from the fifteenth century on, is shown in Dr. Fitzedward Hall's excellent article in Vol. II, No. 7 of this Journal, which treats the idiom historically and supplies copious examples of its use. The very objectionable *ain't* is certainly colloquial, but should not be written, and when used in conversation should be limited to its use as a substitute for *are not*: *I ain't* and *he ain't* are still solecisms, and isolated quotations from Thackeray, Trollope, and *Punch*, will not mend the matter. *Than whom* (p. 233) has established itself, but *than me* for *than I* may well be questioned: of course "bei transitiven Verbis muss der ursprüngliche Kasusunterschied aufrecht erhalten werden" (p. 243), but that is not the question, and Moon's "Paar Bibelstellen gegen Alford" are irrelevant. Let us banish *on to*, *mutual* friend, twenty *clergy*, *party*, but not *person*, *female* for *woman*, and all such Gallicisms as *assist at*, *give upon*, etc.

The quotations from Moon (p. 244) have already done duty in several recent works on rhetoric; but however justly the Dean may be convicted of carelessness in his use of language, I am inclined to agree with Storm and consider Moon hypercritical, too much disposed to play the schoolmaster, and his critical method "wenig empfehlenswerth." The trouble is that when one begins to write upon questions of English usage, every man becomes a critic. No matter what his previous linguistic or philological training may have been, or indeed his opportunities for learning the best usage, every writer feels at liberty to criticise without measure, and to set up his private judgment as, if not law, at least a great part of it. I cannot agree with Mr. Matthew Arnold that we need an Academy to remedy this state of things. Let us never stretch our sturdy English speech upon the Procrustean bed of French precision, but let us try and obtain the consensus of the best English writers and speakers. This is the business of grammarians, and not to lay down *a priori* rules and theories; and if they fail to set down this usage, so much the worse for the grammarians as authorities.

The section of forty pages on the "Vulgar speech" is a very full and excellent collection of examples, though drawn almost exclusively from the writers already mentioned. The author divides these peculiarities into two classes, those resulting from the preservation of old forms of expression which have dropped out of use in cultivated speech or have given way to a learned correctness, and those which have resulted from an extension or a corruption of the laws and tendencies of the language. The former class is treated with special fullness, and it would surprise one who has not given any attention to the subject to see how many old forms of speech are still preserved by the lower classes. I would instance particularly the treatment of the Gerund in *-ing* and its construction with *a*. It is scarcely correct to say "Während *a* jetzt allgemein für vulgär gilt, haben es doch einzelne neuere Schriftsteller wieder aufgenommen": these late writers would not have taken it up again if it were not preserved in archaic phrases, especially in the Bible, which serve to justify their use of it. Had we preserved *ung* or *ing* for the verbal noun, *end* or *ind* for the present participle, and *en* for the dative or gerundial form of the infinitive, even dropping *e* from all, we might have avoided some confusion, and rendered unnecessary much grammatical explanation, but *ing* must now do triple duty. While there may be some justification for the bad English of the first

class of expressions, there is none for the second ; but they serve, as all popular speech (*Volksprache*) does, to illustrate certain tendencies in language. The section closes with a careful summary of the most important peculiarities of pronunciation in this speech. If "Uncle Remus" had been accessible to the author, it would have represented one phase of corrupt English pronunciation better than Dickens and Thackeray have done for the lower classes in England.

The chief writers of American literature are passed over as not differing essentially from the English, but as "most typical" are mentioned "Sam Slick," Maj. Jack Downing's Letters, The Biglow Papers, Artemus Ward, Uncle Tom's Cabin, The Wide, Wide World, Bret Harte and Mark Twain. From this list it is easy to see that American Slang and Colloquial English are not distinguished. This is seen also in the lengthy discussion of Americanisms, the chief work noticed being that of Professor Schele de Vere. Bartlett's dictionary is mentioned, but Storm has not seen it, and thinks "dass es sich nicht mit De Vere's mehr systematischem Werke messen kann." Grant White's articles in *The Galaxy* ('77-'78) and *The Atlantic Monthly* ('78-'79) call for some remarks, although his "Words and their Uses" and "Every-Day English" are not mentioned, and the section closes with a short notice of American pronunciation. While granting that the American ideal is pure English, Storm says (p. 301): "Die grosse Menge selbst gebildeter Leute spricht eine eigenthümliche Sprache, die man nicht nur am Accent, sondern auch an einer Menge besonderer Ausdrücke und Wendungen sogleich erkennt." One would judge so, if Artemus Ward, Bret Harte and Mark Twain are to be taken as representatives of standard American colloquial English. The author seems to have no idea that these writers, and the bulky works on "Americanisms" which he cites, do not represent the ordinary everyday speech of cultivated American homes. He seems not to be aware that the talk in these works sounds almost as strange to an educated American as to himself, and represents in an exaggerated way the speech of only the lowest classes in this country. He thinks that some purists, as R. G. White, try to keep their speech as near as possible to the English normal speech ; but in spite of the purists, Americanisms "zum grossen Theil allgemein verbreitet sind." There are, doubtless, provincialisms in this country, both North and South, as in England itself, and there to a much greater extent than here, but to suppose that Americans talk as Artemus Ward does is to lose all sense of the ridiculous.

Storm shows that some of these "Americanisms" are prevalent in England, and some of the words which he would substitute for the American terms would be styled here "Briticisms." His remarks on the Biblical use of *coast* (p. 315), which seem quite irrelevant, will not suit the Revised Version, which rescinds this obsolete word and substitutes *borders* in Matt. II, 16, Mark V, 17, and *country* in Acts XIX, 1. He rightly corrects the quotation from Chaucer (p. 321), but there is no denying that *lay* and *lie*, *set* and *sit* are often confounded.¹ His Biblical quotation for *proper* (p. 324, note 2) will also no longer answer, as the Revised Version has *goodly*, Heb. XI, 23, just as in Exod. II, 2. Some of our purists who pride themselves on always using *reared* for the Americanism

¹ While we say "to sit *on* a Committee," I have never heard "to sit *on* the Legislature," and no one would say "to sit *on* Congress," which Storm adds (p. 323).

raised may be surprised to learn that an Englishman would always say *brought up*,—which is common enough in this country despite Storm's assertion to the contrary (p. 324, note 3),—while *reared* is, in England, applied most frequently to animals. *Mad* = angry is by no means "auch in Amer. etwas vulgär." It is a good old English word in that sense, as the quotations from the Bible and Shakspeare show, and is of everyday use in this country, even if it is "in England veraltet." *Drawing-room* is "etwas veraltet" here and *parlor* has taken its place; but *station* is as common as *depot*. I must pass over many other points, but would add that I know of no better standard than that set up by Grant White (p. 334): "But in all languages there is, and must be, a standard, and this is the usage of the best society—that is, the most intellectually and socially cultivated society by which it¹ [*i. e.* the language] is spoken. Now, in regard to the English language, that society is the aristocracy and the upper middle classes." This is certainly the case in England; and while we have no aristocracy in this country—at least we are supposed to have none—we have an "intellectually and socially cultivated society," and the usage of this society must be the standard of correct American speech. Foreign writers do not take the pains to find out what the usage of this society is, but judge by such works as those above mentioned.

It may be pertinent to add that in glancing over the first few chapters of William Black's last novel, "The Beautiful Wretch," I found several words and expressions which some might, on the usual principle, style Americanisms, and others which are "aristocratic" slang, *e. g.*, *was you, thank ye, ax yer, dooid* (the New England *u*-sound has crossed the water), *ain't we, conclude* (called an Americanism by Fitzedward Hall, p. 335), *robustious* (included in "Americanisms" by Prof. Schele de Vere, but used by Shakspeare and Swift, as Storm shows, pp. 157, 332, 436), *guess* (regular Down-East), *spoon*, and many others which I do not now recall. It is true that some of these are used by Singing Sal, but she is said to speak with great correctness, and others by a boy of eighteen, who, although a scion of the minor nobility, is devoted to slang, as all boys are; but some are used by Black himself in the narrative portion, and taken altogether they illustrate colloquial English of the present day in England; so I think the two great divisions of the English-speaking people may well "cry quits."²

The accent and tone of American speech are, without doubt, very different from the English, so that the natives of each country readily detect those of the other, and foreigners at once detect both. I recollect well, at a hotel in Antwerp, asking the simple question, "Do you speak English here?" when I was immediately answered, "Yes, and American too." But this is true of different parts of England and of this country also, so that it can often be discovered at once from what State the speaker comes. Storm says (p. 339): "Bei fein gebildeten Amerikanern besonders im Süden ist es bisweilen selbst

¹ Mr. White has made a slip in his grammar here.

² Black's writings would furnish a useful study for modern colloquial English usage, although a writer in *The Nation* (No. 842, Aug. 18, 1881) says of them: "They abound in what would twenty-five years ago have been called slang, but English fiction has been within that period so permeated by slang that a great body of it appears to have become part of the accepted language of novel-writers." If then they are true to nature, this shows that it has become the accepted language of good society in England, however much we may regret it.

Engländern schwer, den fremden Accent zu entdecken," and the peculiarities which he mentions are all prevalent exclusively in the North, except the *ä*-sound of *a*, as *änt*, *däns*, for *aant*, *daans* (*ant*, *dance*),—the latter still prevailing, however, in Boston and in Eastern Virginia, as already mentioned,—and the "vocal murmur" of *r* after vowels, very common in the South, which Storm says is the usual pronunciation now in England too. This is confirmed by Sweet, in his *History of English Sounds*, who, however, carries to an extreme this disappearance of the *r*-sound, giving as examples some words in which *r* is still distinctly pronounced here, as already stated.

The sections on Anthologies, History, Drama, Poetry, Editions with Commentary, Eighteenth Century, and Seventeenth Century to Shakspeare, are very meagre, consisting of but few pages each, only twenty all together, and as they furnish little of interest or information to the English reader, must be passed over.

We have an interesting section on Shakspeare, "Heros der englischen Literatur, diesem Centrum, in welches alle Linien zusammenlaufen" (p. 361), but lack of space will not permit remarks upon it. Storm disclaims being "ein Shakspeare-Kenner," but gives many of the most useful works for the study of Shakspeare. While Furness's *Variorum* edition, Grant White's edition, and Rolfe's edition of the separate plays are included, we miss all mention of Hudson. Dowden's *Mind and Art of Shakspeare* is given, but his very useful little *Primer* omitted. Storm has some critical remarks on *Macbeth*, Act I, relating to Clark and Wright's separate edition, and prints some parallel passages of *Q*₁ (1597), *Q*₂ (1599), and *Q*₃ (1609) of *Romeo and Juliet*, from Mommsen's edition of the play. Relative to the new method of verse-tests for determining the chronological order of the plays, insisted on by Fleay, Furnivall, and others, he quotes from Elze, who thinks that too much has been made of it, and that it is only one of many criteria which must be considered, but that the German "aesthetic" method cannot neglect it. A list of some of the publications of the New Shakspeare Society is given, and a few editions of works of some of Shakspeare's contemporaries are mentioned, but the list is by no means complete.

The chapter closes with a section on the language of the English Bible,¹ of which he says: "Die englische Sprache hat durch die Bibel, Milton, und Shakspeare einen Schatz feierlicher und edler Ausdrücke gewonnen, zu dem wohl keine moderne Kultursprache ein Seitenstück hat." He quotes several pages of the archaic peculiarities of Biblical speech, many of which have, however, been modernized in the Revised Version, thus losing something of the archaic flavor. While referring to the Revision as in preparation, he says: "Der alte Stil und Ton wird hoffentlich unverseht bleiben." This has been in great measure preserved, but some distinctive archaisms, dear to a lover of the older language, have been lost. In one passage the revisers have not observed their own rule of consistency in translation; while they read, *Matt. IV, 2*, "he afterward *hungred*," they retain, *Mark II, 25*, "was *an hungred*," an old euphonic corruption, merely referred to by Storm (p. 411) as "statt der Vorsilbe *a* kommt *an* vor"; cf. A. S. *of-hyngrian*; Wycliffe has here *he hungrede*; Tyndale, *was an hungred* and *was anhungred*; this was, I presume, an oversight in the revi-

¹ From p. 402 to end of chapter, p. 413, "Shakespeare" is a misprint at the top of the page.

sion. Davies's Bible English is specially mentioned as "Eine ausgezeichnete Arbeit, die in systematischer Darstellung gründliche Auskunft giebt über das Verhältniss der Bibelsprache zur gegenwärtigen Sprache."

Chapter VI, on the "History of Literature," is only a three-page list of works, as Storm says: "Nach dem ursprünglichen Plane sollte die Literaturgeschichte in dem zweiten (historischen) Theile dieser Arbeit behandelt werden." The most important works on this subject are, however, included.

Chapter VII, and last, on "Grammar," is also brief, for Storm intended originally to treat the grammar in a separate volume, but as it may be long before he can do this, he mentions briefly the most important works, and may perhaps treat the grammar more fully hereafter. Scientific works, beginning with Maetzner, Koch, and Fiedler and Sachs, are chiefly mentioned, and few school-books are noticed. Of American works Gould Brown's and Prof. Whitney's Grammars alone are included, the former being styled "ein präventiöses, einseitiges und unwissenschaftliches Werk."¹ On the history of the language, Dr. Murray's article in the last (ninth) edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* is considered, "Ohne Vergleich die beste übersichtliche Darstellung der Geschichte der engl. Sprache." Of American works, Marsh's *Lectures* alone are mentioned, Prof. Lounsbury's recent *Hand-book* being apparently unknown. We miss here such a treatment of the Grammar as Storm has given to the Phonology, Colloquial English, and Vulgar English, and which should be included in a scientific work on the living speech. It appears as if the work had grown on the author's hands, and he felt the necessity of cutting it short, not having the time or space to give to an adequate treatment of the grammar, an important part of the analysis of English speech, notwithstanding that English is often said to be "a grammarless tongue." We shall therefore look with more eagerness for his forthcoming work on the grammar, as a necessary complement to the present work, as well as for the second part of this work, which will doubtless be as instructive to the native as to the foreigner, for whom the first part has been specially written. We have no work in English which treats as thoroughly the subjects above mentioned, especially the phonology of our speech, in a succinct view, and by omission and revision a useful English book could be made.

I cannot close this review without heartily praising the clear style in which the work is written, so different from many German works that I wot of, even after translation, which style the author has doubtless acquired from his familiarity with English and French literature.

J. M. GARNETT.

¹ We are glad to learn (p. 422) that Sweet is preparing a complete English Grammar, and concur with Storm in expecting a thorough and independent work.